



The Corporation of the City of Sault Ste. Marie  
Regular Meeting of City Council  
Addendum

Monday, April 7, 2025

5:00 pm

Council Chambers and Video Conference

As a courtesy, meetings are available for viewing on the City's YouTube channel  
<https://www.youtube.com/user/SaultSteMarieOntario>

---

|  | Pages        |
|--|--------------|
| <b>7. Communications and Routine Reports of City Departments, Boards and Committees – Consent Agenda</b> |              |
| <b>7.17 Elbows Up Rally</b>  |              |
| <b>7.17.1 <i>Mayor's Youth Advisory Committee Correspondence</i></b>                                     | <b>2 - 2</b> |
| <b>8. Reports of City Departments, Boards and Committees</b>   |              |
| <b>8.7 Planning</b>  |              |
| <b>8.7.1 0 Chippewa Street A-02-2025-Z.OP 57T-25-501, 502, 503</b>                                       |              |
| <b>8.7.1.1 <i>Additional Correspondence</i></b>  | <b>3 - 6</b> |

**Rachel Tyczinski**

---

**Subject:** FW: "Elbows Up" Rally

**Attention Mayor Shoemaker and Council,**

**My questions are concerning the upcoming proposed "Elbows Up" rally, as mentioned in agenda item 7.17 of the City Council Agenda. While the event has garnered attention, I noticed that there's no specific mention of how the city's youth can get involved or contribute to the rally. Youth engagement in events like this can be an important opportunity for growth, education, and fostering community spirit.**

**Has the event organizer considered ways to incorporate youth involvement, either through volunteer opportunities, participation in the planning stages, or other forms of engagement? If not, might City Council explore options for ensuring that young people have the opportunity to participate in meaningful ways?**

**Thank you for your time and consideration.**

**Adam Bernardo (MYAC Chair)**

Jean-Noel Candau

April 6<sup>th</sup> 2025

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

To: Planning Division  
City of Sault Ste Marie

Object: Opposition to Proposed Residential Development 0 Chippewa Street (A-2-25-Z 57T)

Dear Members of the City Planning Division,

I am writing to formally express my opposition to the proposed residential development project located at 0 Chippewa Street (Application No.: A-2-25-Z 57T). While I understand the need for thoughtful growth and housing in our community, I have serious concerns regarding the developer's lack of experience in undertaking projects of this nature and scale.

At the public meeting I attended at the Northern Community Centre on December 21<sup>st</sup> 2023, Mr. Harjinder Kang, the developer owner of Mamta Homes, presented a series of computer-generated pictures of houses and residential developments that was there to suggest that he is an experienced builder. At this meeting, I personally asked Mr. Kang about his experience as a developer, how many homes he has already effectively built and what was the size of the biggest development he had completed at the time. After some back and forth, he reluctantly admitted that his company has never developed a project even close to the size of the proposal and his experience is limited to the construction of only a handful of single-detached homes.

The success of any residential development depends greatly on the expertise and track record of the developer. In this case, the developer has no verifiable history of completing similar projects, raising valid concerns about their ability to manage the complexities of planning, construction, environmental compliance, and long-term maintenance.

Approving this project without sufficient evidence of the developer's capability puts our community at risk of enduring substandard construction, delays, safety issues, and potentially incomplete or abandoned development. We have seen in our own city and other municipalities how inexperienced developers have left neighborhoods with unfinished infrastructure and unresolved environmental impacts—issues that ultimately become the burden of the city and its residents.

I urge the Planning Division to consider these risks seriously. At the very least, a more thorough vetting process should be conducted to assess the developer's qualifications, financial backing,

and detailed plans for ensuring quality standards are met. A decision of this magnitude should not be made without a clear demonstration of competence and accountability.

Thank you for your time and for considering the voices of community members who care deeply about responsible development.

Sincerely,  
Jean-Noel Candau

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jean-Noel Candau", enclosed within a large, loopy, horizontal oval stroke.

Good day Jonathan,

I just wanted to voice my concern over this development. There are 35 residences from the corner of Broadview to the dead end of Chippewa and the subject property. There is probably no one that utilizes this incredible green space as much as I do on a daily basis. The residents here have enjoyed incredible peace and quiet and limited traffic for a long, long time. I have been a resident here since my family moved here from the Hudson Street expropriation/Carmen's Way project, some 20 years ago. I along with my neighbours have enjoyed our dog walks through the field and the numerous trails on the hillside. All of our dogs take full advantage of the West Davignon Creek in the summer for cooling drinks and swims.

Now we are faced with a development that will change the neighbourhood forever. The pristine serenity we all enjoy and was the main attraction of purchasing here in the first place. Numerous families over the years have enjoyed the field and hills for countless decades. It's an all-season playground for many. Countless kids come from the surrounding neighbourhoods for the safe sledding and tobogganing it offers. Other families atv and snowmachine here throughout the winter. I along with many of my neighbours express our concern over the increased traffic that inevitably will come. Using the formula that a residence often has two vehicles and based on projections of 180 units and 104 townhouses, one can then assume 284 units might contribute 500-600 additional vehicles using Chippewa and the other planned thoroughfare for access. That's a 7-8 fold increase of vehicular traffic, ballpark!

One of the great things about this street is the respect and consideration we all have for each other. Speeds are most often in the 40 kmh area or less, out of concern for the children and dogs, that are both numerous. As there are no sidewalks, everyone walks the streets with little concern for their safety as consideration is paramount. What guarantees will we have as a huge traffic increase will put people and their children at risk? I fear the certainty and inevitably of an accident involving a child with all the extra traffic.

As property owners and taxpayers, (I'm over 6000 \$/year), we will have to endure several years of large trucks, heavy equipment and contractors using our street as the service artery to their job site. Has anyone looked at the potential ramifications to our foundations with all this heavy truck traffic? Who would be then responsible for cracked foundations?

As many of us have witnessed in other developments of this magnitude, whether here or elsewhere, there is huge amount of dirt and clay that will be adhering to the tires of these trucks on a daily basis and left on the road surface. Many with expensive paved driveways will now have to contend with the extra mud and dirt and the additional work to keep it under control.

Now to the field itself. It's a beautiful preserve with the accompanying woodlots. As a biologist and a fisheries technician for over 40 years, I know what will happen with this development. All the fauna will disappear and in its' place garbage will proliferate the beautiful West Davignon Creek. This creek is home to multiple fish species from brook and rainbow trout and coho and chinook salmon in the fall. It is also a provincial fish sanctuary where its' crucial spawning habitat would be in jeopardy.

I have seen the destruction of numerous rivers in Southern Ontario on my work trips. As soon as a development borders a creek or river, the pollution will soon follow. Quite succinctly, people are slob. Those that don't have a vested interest or a respect for nature will destroy it in short order. Grocery

carts, plastic bottles and other garbage will be dumped there. One only has to see what gets dumped in the East Davignon near the Market Mall as evidence, despite the best efforts of the Conservation Authority to continually clean it.

People that can't afford the tipping fees at the municipal landfill will clandestinely dispose of their garbage over the fence under the cloak of darkness. I've seen it countless time and it always happens, guaranteed.

Over my countless walks over the years, I have watched 3 different species of owls, barred, snowy and short-eared. Hawk species from northern harriers, red-tailed , kestrels and merlins. Bald eagles are often perched in the surrounding trees. Black-crowned night herons, great blue herons , sand hill cranes and American bitterns all feed in the field and nearby drainages.

There are 5-7 deer that are residents along the creek. Coyotes, black bears are often seen as well. Perhaps, not the preferred species people want to see but nonetheless integral to the biodiversity for the area. Creekside, mink, otters , foxes, weasels are often seen along with snowshoe hares and ruffed grouse. These species will all be supplanted if this development goes through.

I know the city is looking at the lucrative tax base that would be generated from this development, but what about the strain on the already stretched budget, the workforce, and the equipment? We just witnessed the most impactful winter since 1995, where services were stretched to the limits, and now we want to add a large subdivision to further test those limits farther.

I know these submissions are not taken seriously as they stand in the way of progress. I believe I have addressed many of my concerns along with my neighbours but I truly hope that this does not go ahead. There has to be alternative sites that would not have all the ecological and personal ramifications elsewhere.

Thank you and respectfully submitted.

Chris Sierzputowski, [REDACTED]